FILED
JUN 29 1950
CHARLES ELMORE CROPLEY
CLERK

No. 160

SUPREME COURT

of the United States

REYNOLDS SPRING COMPANY,
Petitioner,

vs.

COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE,
Respondent.

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT

– and –

BRIEF IN SUPPORT THEREOF

THOMAS G. LONG,
Attorney for Petitioner.
1361 National Bank Bldg.
Detroit 26, Michigan

CAPITOL PRINTING CO., LAW PRINTERS, DETROIT, MICH.

SUBJECT INDEX

PAGE

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI 1

II I. Summary Statement of the Matter Involved 1

I II. Statement Disclosing Basis of this Court's Jurisdiction 2

III. Questions Presented 3

IV. Reasons Relied On for Allowance of the Return 3

V. Prayer for Writ 5

BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI 6

II I. Opinions Below 6

I II. Statement of the Case 6

III. Specification of Errors 7

IV. Argument 8

V. Conclusion 15

APPENDIX 16

Internal Revenue Code, Section 718 16

Internal Revenue Code, Section 728 17

CASES CITED

Boudreau vs. Commissioner, 134 Fed. (2d) 360 (5) 14

Fleming vs. Commissioner, 146 Fed. (2d) 219 (6) 14

General Securities Co. vs. Commissioner, 123 Fed. (2d) 192 4-12

LaBelle Iron Works vs. U. S., 256 U. S. 377 3-9

R. D. Merrill vs. Commissioner, 4 T. C. 935 13

Sherman vs. Commissioner, 153 Fed. (2d) 361 (5) 14

Statutes

Internal Revenue Code, Section 111 14

Internal Revenue Code, Section 115 ..... 7, 10, 12, 13, 14

Internal Revenue Code, Section 27 (d) 10

Internal Revenue Code, Section 718 ..... 7, 8, 13

Internal Revenue Code, Section 728 ..... 4, 12

United States Code, Title 28, Section 1254 3

No.....

SUPREME COURT

of the United States

REYNOLDS SPRING COMPANY,

Petitioner,

vs.

COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE,

Respondent.

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT

TO THE HONORABLE, THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES:

Your Petitioner respectfully shows:

I.

SUMMARY STATEMENT OF THE MATTER INVOLVED

There is here presented a question of invested capital for the purposes of excess profits taxes of the years 1940 and 1941. The case was submitted upon a Stipulation of Facts (R. 35-9) and the Returns (R. 34) not printed. There is no difference of view as to the facts or any inference therefrom.

Petitioner in 1931 declared and distributed as a dividend in kind in partial liquidation shares of capital stock (being all the outstanding shares) of General Leather Company which Petitioner had acquired in 1924, by issuing shares of its own capital stock therefor. The question is whether by reason of such dividend in kind there should be deducted from equity invested capital the amount which was added thereto when said shares were acquired or the fair value of said shares at the time of such dividend in kind. There is no mention of a dividend in kind in the statute, which provides what shall be added and what shall be deducted in arriving at invested capital. The Commissioner deducted the amount which was added to invested capital at the time of the acquisition. The Tax Court upheld and the Court of Appeals affirmed. In no other situation which has been conceived is there ever a deduction of the amount added at the time of acquisition. At the time of acquisition the fair value of the shares was $2,412,875.83 (R. 36). And at the time (7 years later—the second year of the depression) of distribution in dividend in kind the fair value was $742,830.00 (R. 38). Petitioner had a substantial deficit which had arisen from operations, $698,760.84 at the beginning of the year 1931, in which the shares were distributed in dividend in kind (R. 38), and had no taxable income in said year. The distribution was charged on the books in such manner as to increase the deficit by $2,412,875.83 (R. 38). But the amount of a deficit still continues as "invested capital."

II.

STATEMENT DISCLOSING BASIS OF THIS COURT'S JURISDICTION

The Decree of the United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, a review of which is here sought, was

entered April 19, 1950 (R. 47). The statutory provision relied upon to sustain the jurisdiction of this Court is Section 1254 of Title 28 of the United States Code, as amended to January 1, 1950.

III.

QUESTION PRESENTED

There is only one question involved in this petition:

> Where a corporation acquires property (shares of capital stock of another corporation) by the original issue of its own capital stock and after holding such property for seven (7) years makes a distribution (not out of accumulated earnings and profits) in kind of such property to its (the acquiring Corporation's) stockholders, is the equity invested capital (under Section 718 of the Internal Revenue Code) of such corporation reduced thereby by the value of the property (shares so distributed) at the time of distribution, or at the time of acquisition?

IV.

REASONS RELIED ON FOR ALLOWANCE OF WRIT

1. The Court of Appeals has decided a Federal question, namely, what is meant by "invested capital" as used in the excess profits tax law in a way which conflicts with the applicable decision of this Court in *LaBelle Iron Works vs. U. S.*, 256 U. S. 377. In the cited case this Court said that by invested capital was meant money or money's worth laid out or embarked in the enterprise. In the instant case the Court of Appeals talks about "inflated computa-

tions" (R. 51, l. 37), and "actual capital investment" (R. 53, l. 9), and "the same basis should be used in determining loss" (R. 53, l. 4), clearly treating it as something to be determined as of some later date as affected by changes in the interim and not confined to the time the particular item of capital was embarked in the enterprise.

2. The Court of Appeals has decided an important question of Federal law which has not been but should be settled by this Court, namely the effect on invested capital (for excess profits tax purposes) of dealing with assets in a manner not specifically mentioned in the statute as by a dividend in kind. Should there be a different effect in this one case from that in all cases specifically mentioned in the statute and all other cases which have been conceived? This is apparently a case of first instance in the Courts. No case seems to have heretofore been presented involving any question of "deduction" in arriving at invested capital.

3. The effect on the distributing Corporation of a dividend in kind was held by the Tenth Circuit (*General Securities Company vs. Commissioner,* 123 Fed. (2d) 192) to be "the value of assets distributed" *at the time of distribution,* whereas the Sixth Circuit has held in the instant case the effect to be value *at the time of acquisition.* True, the holdings were for different purposes—the Tenth Circuit for dividends paid credit, and the Sixth for equity invested capital. But the same matter—Dividend in Kind—cannot have one effect for one purpose and another effect for another purpose. Especially where the statute—Section 728*—specifically states "the terms used" in the one chapter "shall have the same meaning" as in the other chapter.

---

*Set forth in full, infra 17.

4. The Court of Appeals has so far departed from the accepted and usual course of judicial proceedings as to find "a gap in the law" (no specific mention in the statute of dividend in kind) and then to fill that gap in such a way as to make the gap an exception from all other cases instead of filling the gap to conform to all other cases. Petitioner maintains there is no gap, but if there is a Court should either fill it to conform or leave it alone. Petitioner maintains there is no gap because the statute provides what deductions shall be made in arriving at invested capital from which it must follow that what is not so provided to be deducted is not to be deducted.

V.

PRAYER FOR WRIT

Wherefore, your Petitioner respectfully prays that a Writ of Certiorari issue out of and under the seal of this Honorable Court, directed to the United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, commanding that Court to certify and send to this Court for its review and determination a full and complete transcript of the record and all proceedings of that Court had in this case, which is numbered and entitled on its docket 10,945, REYNOLDS SPRING COMPANY, a Delaware Corporation, Petitioner, vs. COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE, Respondent, to the end that this cause may be reviewed and determined by this Court; that the judgment of that Court be reversed, and for such further relief as to this Court may seem proper.

THOMAS G. LONG,
Counsel for Petitioner.

No.....

Supreme Court of the United States

REYNOLDS SPRING COMPANY,
Petitioner,

vs.

COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE,
Respondent.

BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

I.

OPINIONS BELOW

The Opinion of the Tax Court (R. 20), was rendered January 31, 1949, and is reported in 12 T. C. No. 16 (paged volume not yet received). The Opinion of the United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit (R. 48), was handed down April 19, 1950, and has not been reported at the time of the printing hereof.

II.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

The statement appearing at pages 1 and 2 in the Petition for Writ of Certiorari is deemed adequate and is hereby adopted and made a part of this Brief.

III.

SPECIFICATION OF ERRORS

Petitioner intends to urge and rely upon each of the following errors assigned to the Judgment of the United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit:

1. In not holding that "invested capital" as used in the excess profits tax law means money or money's worth laid out or embarked in the enterprise and is unaffected by any subsequent change in the value of the property in which invested.

2. In not holding that "invested capital" is subject to reduction only by the deductions provided in Section 718(b).

3. In not according to "distributions" as used in Section 718 (b) (1) the same meaning as in Section 115 (c), namely—value at time of distribution.

4. In holding that invested capital of a corporation making a distribution in kind can be affected in a different amount in respect of the property distributed than the stockholder who receives the distribution.

5. In holding that the increase in the deficit of Petitioner by the distribution in kind reduced the invested capital.

IV.

ARGUMENT

There is but one ultimate question presented by this case, namely—that stated in the Petition for Certiorari, supra 3.

This case concerns the application of Section 718 of the Internal Revenue Code. The section is set forth in all necessary part, infra 16. This case concerns solely the acquisition of the capital stock of another corporation by the issue by Petitioner Corporation of shares of its capital stock and the distribution (7 years later in the second year of the depression), of the capital stock so acquired as a dividend in kind to the then shareholders of Petitioner in *partial liquidation.* This distribution was nine (9) years before the tax year here in question.

The pertinent provisions of Section 718, therefore, are:

Equity invested capital

> "*shall be the sum of the following amounts.*
>
> • • •
>
> (2) Property • • • previously paid in • • • for stock • • •. Such property shall be included in an amount equal to its basis (unadjusted) for determining loss upon sale or exchange
>
> "*reduced as provided in subsection* (*b*)
>
> (b) The amount by which equity invested capital • • • shall be reduced • • • as provided in subsection (a) shall be the sum of the following amounts—

(1) *Distributions in Previous Years*—Distributions made prior to such taxable year which were not out of accumulated earnings and profits;

Then follow several other provisions, none of which are applicable or have any relevancy to the determination of the question here presented.

Invested capital (for excess profits tax purposes) does not mean the value (market, book or otherwise) of the assets employed in the business during the period in question. But rather as indicated in *LaBelle Iron Works vs. U. S.*, 256 U. S. 377.

Money or Money's Worth *Laid Out* by the Investors In *Embarking* Their Means In the Enterprise*

The propositions following are generally regarded as not open to question:

If property acquired by a corporation—

is retained by the corporation any lessening in value below cost is of no effect on invested capital;

is sold by the corporation at less than cost the loss does not affect *invested* capital but *earned* surplus only;

is wholly lost by total destruction (as physical property by fire or tornado, or corporate stock by bankruptcy of the corporation), the effect is but the same as in case of a sale.

---

*Not a literal quotation but see: Page 388, lines 5 and 6;
Page 390, lines 6 and 7.

Impaired Capital Is Still Invested Capital

If the distribution here in question had been a *taxable dividend the* shareholders receiving it would have been taxed *at the value at the time of distribution.*

Internal Revenue Code, Sec. 27 (d);

Regulations 111, Sec. 29.115-10.

Petitioner's dividend paid credit would also have been the value at the time of distribution.

Internal Revenue Code, Sec. 29.27(d);

Regulations 111, Sec. 29.27(d)-1.

While this was not a dividend taxable in the year of distribution, nevertheless it went to reduce the shareholders' base and hence would affect future taxes in event of sale by the shareholders or complete liquidation by the corporation. A holder of shares of Petitioner in 1931 who acquired his stock in 1924 at market would have a cost base of $53.80* per share. If the distribution in 1931 is to be charged against his base at the value of General Leather stock *at the time of acquisition* the reduction would be $16.25 per share, whereas if reduced by the value *at the time of distribution* the reduction would be $5.00 per share. Thus the shareholder in the event of sale of his stock or liquidation of the corporation is to be taxed on $11.25 per share on which he would not be taxed if the dividend had

*The figures in this paragraph are approximate in round figures. They are readily calculable from the figures in the record as printed and Exhibit A not printed. As the figures are used merely as illustrative it is deemed not necessary to set out the calculations in detail nor make reference to the pages of the Record.

been a presently taxable dividend. In fact, he is to be taxed on $11.25 as profit which is in very fact the loss he has sustained in the General Leather Stock transaction. This is legerdemain in effect.

It is obvious that the proper *corporate accounting* of the distribution in partial liquidation would be to deduct the value at the time of distribution $742,830.00 from capital and charge the difference, $1,670,045.83, between that value and value at the time of acquisition to surplus. But where as here the Company already had a deficit of $698,760.84, the effect of any proper charges was necessarily to increase the overall deficit by the amount which had been entered on the books at the time of acquisition. But as before stated, increase in deficit does not affect invested capital.

The opinion of the Court of Appeals talks about a construction "essential to guard against inflated computations" (R. 51, l. 7), and to avoid a computation "which does not accurately reflect actual capital investment" (R. 53, l. 9), but *equity invested capital* is not supposed to represent the capital still continuing to be held in the enterprise. It does not under any of the conditions stated supra 9, as to which there can be no question. Equity invested capital is as indicated in the *LaBelle Iron Works* case, supra 9—that which was *embarked* in the enterprise. It makes no difference what has become of it. "Actual capital investment" in the tax year involved has nothing to do with the question.

The Court of Appeals further said, "In the distribution the corporation returned to the stockholders the identical property which had been previously invested" (R. 51, l. 2).

That is to say, that the stockholders now hold directly the same shares that they formerly held collectively through the corporation and therefore nothing had been affected. But this is not correct, for the corporation is for tax purposes an entity in itself. And as pointed out, supra 10, the stockholder's tax base for the future has been affected so that a portion of the remaining value of his shares in Petitioner Corporation will, in the event of a sale or liquidation, be taxed as profit whereas that portion is in fact a loss.

The decision of the Tenth Circuit referred to in point 3 of the Petition for Certiorari, supra 4 (*General Securities Company vs. Commissioner,* 123 Fed. (2d) 192), dealt (just as does the instant case) with a dividend in kind in shares of the capital stock of a second corporation which had been acquired by the Petitioner Corporation by the issue of shares of its own capital stock. The shares of the second corporation had in each case decreased in value between the time of acquisition and the time of distribution. The Tenth Circuit in that case held the "adjusted basis" could not be used saying the "actual assets, surplus and earnings were only reduced to the extent of the value of the asset distributed" (page 194, column 2, lines 28 to 30). The Sixth Circuit in the instant case held the "adjusted basis" for gain or loss must be used in determining the effect of the dividend in kind on invested capital. Section 728 (set forth in full, infra 17), expressly provides "the terms used" for the one purpose "shall have the same meaning" for the other purpose. The term here in question used in each chapter is "distribution"—singular or plural. It is in Section 115(a) of the Internal Revenue Code before the Tenth Circuit in the *General Securities*

case, and Section 718(b) (1) before the Sixth Circuit in the instant case. As it is required to be given the same meaning in each case it cannot have opposite results.

The Court of Appeals (R. 52) and Tax Court as well (R. 26), cite and quote from the case of *R. D. Merrill vs. Commissioner,* 4 T. C. 935. There the Company had an earned surplus and the Tax Court ruled that the excess in cost of dividend in kind over market value should be charged against earned surplus. Obviously, as the Tax Court there said, if this were not done the Company would be *carrying an asset on its books* which the Company no longer had. In the instant case, Petitioner had no earned surplus and therefore had to enter the amount as a surplus deficit. But in either case this is but ordinary and obviously required *corporate accounting.* It has nothing to do with the question with which we are concerned in determining equity invested capital, namely—what money or money's worth was *embarked* in (at any time made a part of the capital of) the enterprise. Corporate accounting has to do with what money or money's worth is in the enterprise at the current date—not the date of the inception. No question of invested capital was involved in the Merrill case.

The word "distribution" used in Section 718 (b) (1) had a well-defined meaning in the income tax law before and at the time the word was put into the excess profits tax law on the enactment of the latter on October 8, 1940. The word had long been used in Section 115 of the Internal Revenue Code and earlier Acts. In Section 115 (c) it is provided—"amounts distributed in partial liquidation of a corporation shall be treated as in part or full payment in exchange for the stock." This is the provision under which the tax base of the stockholders receiving the "distribu-

tion" here in question is to be determined. Section 115 (c) further provides that the "gain or loss" to the distributee resulting from [a distribution in liquidation, partial or complete] shall be determined under Section 111. In turn, Section 111 (b) provides "the amount realized from the sale or other disposition of property shall be the sum of any money received plus the fair market value of the property (other than money) received." Thus it is beyond question that so far as concerns the stockholder the distribution which has been made to him is the fair market value at the time of such distribution. Section 728 provides, "the terms used in this chapter [relating to excess profits tax] shall have the same meaning as when used in Chapter 1," i. e., the chapter relating to income tax.

If anything further is needed beyond the plain words of the statute the following *liquidation cases* all hold that the factor which affects the taxpayer's base is the fair market value of that which was received in liquidation at the time so received.

Boudreau vs. Commissioner, 134 Fed. (2d) 360 (5);

Sherman vs. Commissioner, 146 Fed. (2d) 219 (6);

Fleming vs. Commissioner, 153 Fed. (2d) 361 (5).

It cannot be that the "distribution" in the statute means one thing as applied to the distributee stockholder and another thing as applied to the distributing corporation. Especially where the statute expressly says the words shall have the same meaning in each chapter.

It is respectfully submitted that a question is here involved of a nature which this Court should pass upon and that error has been committed by the Court of Appeals and the Writ of Certiorari should be granted.

THOMAS G. LONG,
Counsel for Petitioner.

Business address:
1881 National Bank Bldg.
Detroit 26, Michigan

APPENDIX

INTERNAL REVENUE CODE:

SEC. 718 [As added by Section 201, Second Revenue Act of 1940, c. 757, 54 Stat. 974]. EQUITY INVESTED CAPITAL.

(a) *Definition.*—The equity invested capital for any day of any taxable year shall be determined as of the beginning of such day and shall be the sum of the following amounts, reduced as provided in subsection (b)—

(1) *Money Paid In.*—Money previously paid in for stock, or as paid-in surplus, or as a contribution to capital;

(2) *Property Paid In.*—Property (other than money) previously paid in (regardless of the time paid in) for stock, or as paid-in surplus, or as a contribution to capital. Such property shall be included in an amount equal to its basis (unadjusted) for determining loss upon sale or exchange. If the property was disposed of before such taxable year, such basis shall be determined in the same manner as if the property were still held at the beginning of such taxable year. If such unadjusted basis is a substituted basis it shall be adjusted, with respect to the period before the property was paid in, in the manner provided in Section 113 (b) (2);

(3) *Distributions in Stock.*—Distributions in stock—

• • •

(4) [As amended by Section 203, Revenue Act of 1941, c. 412, 55 Stat. 687.] *Earnings and Profits at Beginning of Year.*—The accumulated earnings and profits as of the beginning of such taxable years;

• • •

(b) *Reduction in Equity-Invested Capital.* — The amount by which the equity-invested capital for any day shall be reduced as provided in subsection (a) shall be the sum of the following amounts—

(1) *Distributions in Previous Years.*—Distributions made prior to such taxable year which were not out of accumulated earnings and profits;

(2) *Distributions During the Year.* — Distributions previously made during such taxable year which are not out of the earnings and profits of such taxable year;

• • •

SECTION 728. The terms used in this subchapter shall have the same meaning as when used in Chapter I.

INDEX

	Page
Opinions below	1
Jurisdiction	1
Question presented	2
Statute involved	3
Statement	4
Argument	6
Conclusion	12

CITATIONS

Cases:

Brown Shoe Co. v. *Commissioner*, 339 U. S. 583	11
Commissioner v. *Wheeler*, 324 U. S. 542	9
La Belle Iron Works v. *United States*, 256 U. S. 377	7, 11
Merrill, R. D., Co. v. *Commissioner*, 4 T.C. 955	9

Statute:

Internal Revenue Code: :	
Sec. 712 (26 U.S.C. 1946 ed., Sec. 712)	6
Sec. 713 (26 U.S.C. 1946 ed., Sec. 713)	6
Sec. 714 (26 U.S.C. 1946 ed., Sec. 714)	6
Sec. 718 (26 U.S.C. 1946 ed., Sec. 718)	2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10
Sec. 719 (26 U.S.C. 1946 ed., Sec. 719)	6

Miscellaneous:

7A Mertens, Law of Federal Income Taxation, Sec. 42.115	9
II Montgomery's Federal Taxes Corporations and Partnerships (1946-1947), pp. 411-412	9

In the Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1950

No. 160

REYNOLDS SPRING COMPANY, A DELAWARE CORPORATION, PETITIONER

v.

COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT

BRIEF FOR THE RESPONDENT IN OPPOSITION

OPINIONS BELOW

The opinion of the Tax Court (R. 20-26) is reported at 12 T.C. 110. The opinion of the Court of Appeals (R. 48-53) is reported at 181 F. 2d 638.

JURISDICTION

The judgment of the Court of Appeals was entered on April 19, 1950. (R. 47.) The petition for

a writ of certiorari was filed on June 29, 1950. The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U.S.C., Section 1254.

QUESTION PRESENTED

The taxpayer had received, as a contribution to its capital, certain property, in exchange for which it had issued its own shares of capital stock. Later, but prior to the taxable year, the taxpayer distributed this property to its shareholders at a time when it possessed a deficit in its earnings and profits account. When distributed, the property possessed a market value which was less than its tax basis to the taxpayer.

Under Section 718(a)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code, there was properly included in the taxpayer's equity invested capital, as property paid in for stock, the unadjusted basis of the property for determining loss. Section 718(b)(1) requires that equity invested capital shall be reduced by the amount of prior distributions which were not out of accumulated earnings and profits.

The question is whether, as the courts below held, the amount of the reduction under Section 718(b)(1) is determined by the tax basis of the property to the distributing corporation, or whether, as the taxpayer contends, the amount of the deduction is determined by the fair market value of the property at the time when it is distributed by the corporation.

STATUTE INVOLVED

Internal Revenue Code:

SEC. 718 [as added by Section 201, Second Revenue Act of 1940, c. 757, 54 Stat. 974]. EQUITY INVESTED CAPITAL.

(a) *Definition.*—The equity invested capital for any day of any taxable year shall be determined as of the beginning of such day and shall be the sum of the following amounts, reduced as provided in subsection (b)—

(1) *Money paid in.*—Money previously paid in for stock, or as paid-in surplus, or as a contribution to capital;

(2) *Property paid in.*—Property (other than money) previously paid in (regardless of the time paid in) for stock, or as paid-in surplus, or as a contribution to capital. Such property shall be included in an amount equal to its basis (unadjusted) for determining loss upon sale or exchange. If the property was disposed of before such taxable year, such basis shall be determined in the same manner as if the property were still held at the beginning of such taxable year. If such unadjusted basis is a substituted basis it shall be adjusted, with respect to the period before the property was paid in, in the manner provided in section 113(b)(2);

(3) *Distributions in Stock.*—Distributions in stock—

* * * * *

(4) [As amended by Section 203, Revenue Act of 1941, c. 412, 55 Stat. 687] *Earnings and Profits at Beginning of Year.*—The accumulated earnings and profits as of the beginning of such taxable years;

* * * * *

(b) *Reduction in Equity Invested Capital.*—The amount by which the equity invested capital for any day shall be reduced as provided in subsection (a) shall be the sum of the following amounts—

(1) *Distributions in Previous Years.*—Distributions made prior to such taxable year which were not out of accumulated earnings and profits;

(2) *Distributions During the Year.*—Distributions previously made during such taxable year which are not out of the earnings and profits of such taxable year;

* * * * *

(26 U.S.C. 1946 ed., Sec. 718.)

STATEMENT

This case involves asserted deficiencies in excess-profits taxes. The pertinent facts were stipulated (R. 35-39) and were found by the Tax Court as stipulated (R. 20-24). In 1924, the taxpayer, which had been incorporated in 1919, acquired all the capital stock (6,438 shares) of General Leather Company. In payment for the General Leather Company stock, the taxpayer issued 210,548 shares

of its own common stock. The fair market value of the General Leather Company stock acquired by the taxpayer, and the book value of the stock issued by the taxpayer, was $2,412,875.83 each. This amount was credited to the taxpayer's capital stock account. (R. 20, 21-22, 35, 36.)

Immediately prior to March 31, 1931, the taxpayer had an "earned surplus deficit" of $698,-760.84. On that day, it distributed all the General Leather Company stock to its shareholders, the original shares having been increased from 6,438 to 148,566 by a split-up which was designed to facilitate the distribution. The distribution was made pursuant to a prior resolution of the taxpayer's board of directors, which had denominated the distribution as a "liquidating dividend." The fair market value of all the General Leather Company stock at the time of the distribution was $742,830. The original book value of the stock, $2,412,875.83, was charged to capital surplus on the taxpayer's books. (R. 22-23, 37-38.)

In computing its excess profits tax credit based on invested capital, the taxpayer, under Section 718(a)(2), Internal Revenue Code, included in its equity invested capital the original book value of the General Leather Company stock (which was also its unadjusted basis for determining loss), namely, $2,412,875.83, as property paid in for stock, but decreased its equity invested capital, under Section 718(b)(1), as a prior distribution

not out of earnings and profits, only by the value of the stock when distributed. (R. 23, 38.)

The Commissioner determined deficiencies in excess profits taxes on the ground that the reduction in equity invested capital under Section 718(b)(1) on account of the distribution of the General Leather Company stock was to be in the same amount (unadjusted basis for determining loss) by which Section 718(a)(2) required that equity invested capital be augmented on account of the original contribution of the same property to the taxpayer's capital. (R. 24, 38-39.) The Tax Court sustained the Commissioner's deficiency determination (R. 20-26) and the Court of Appeals affirmed (R. 48-53).

ARGUMENT

1. The decision below is correct. The equity invested capital of a corporate taxpayer, used as one of the methods of determining what profits were to be taxed under the excess profits tax, is purely a statutory concept.[1] Equity invested capital is not the value of the assets used by the corporate taxpayer during the taxable year. Unrealized appreciations or depreciations of property owned by the taxpayer do not affect the

[1] Section 712, Internal Revenue Code, added by Section 201, Second Revenue Act of 1940, c. 757, 54 Stat. 974, as amended, provides for a credit based on income under Section 713, or based on invested capital under Section 714, whichever results in the lower tax. The credit in this case was based on invested capital, which includes equity invested capital, as defined in Section 718, plus borrowed invested capital, as defined in Section 719.

amount of the credit, just as was true of the tax enacted during the prior war. *La Belle Iron Works* v. *United States,* 256 U.S. 377. Instead, the emphasis is on the capital invested by the stockholders and permitted to remain in the enterprise, such capital including not only direct capital contributions but also profits not withdrawn. Capital once contributed, but later withdrawn, diminishes equity invested capital. Thus, equity invested capital includes money paid in as capital contributions (Section 718(a)(1), *supra*), property paid in for stock, in the amount of its unadjusted basis for determining loss (Section 718(a)(2), *supra*), profits which have been capitalized by means of taxable stock dividends (Section 718(a)(3), *supra*), profits which have not been capitalized but which have not been withdrawn from the business, namely, the corporation's accumulated earnings and profits (Section 718(a)(4), *supra*), and a portion of new capital contributed (Section 718(a)(6)).

To the extent that prior profits have been withdrawn in the form of taxable dividends, such withdrawals will have reduced accumulated earnings and profits and, hence, the amount that would have been in equity invested capital except for such withdrawals. To provide for other withdrawals from the business, reductions of capital in effect, Section 718(a) and (b) provide that equity invested capital shall be reduced by the

amount of distributions which were not out of earnings and profits and which were made during previous years (Section 718(b)(1), *supra*) or during the taxable year (Section 718(b)(2), *supra*).

The ultimate issue in this case is whether there should be a residual effect on equity invested capital with respect to property once contributed by the stockholders to the corporation but withdrawn from the capital of the business long before the excess profits tax year. The General Leather Company stock, which was contributed to the taxpayer's capital in 1924, augmented equity invested capital by the amount of its unadjusted basis for determining loss (equal to its then fair market value) under the express provisions of Section 718(a)(2). Since the very same property was withdrawn from the business in 1931, the excess profits tax situation in 1940 and 1941 should be the same as though the stockholders had never made this particular contribution to the taxpayer's capital. While Section 718(b)(1) does not specify what basis should be used in reducing equity invested capital where there has been a reduction in capital by the return of physical property to the stockholders, it seems sensible to construe that section, as the lower courts did, as requiring the use of the same basis specified by Section 718(a)(2) for inclusion in equity invested capital with respect to physical property contributed to capital. Such a construction results

in giving the taxpayer credit for all capital contributions and profits which the stockholders have permitted to remain invested in the business. This is a rational interpretation of the Congressional intent which is supported by 7A Mertens, Law of Federal Income Taxation, Sec. 42.115; and II Montgomery's Federal Taxes Corporations and Partnerships (1946-1947), pp. 411-412. See also *R. D. Merrill Co.* v. *Commissioner,* 4 T.C. 955.

To include property contributed to the corporation in the amount of the basis specified in Section 718(a)(2), but to reduce equity invested capital under Section 718(b)(1) by the fair market value of the same property if it is withdrawn from capital by the stockholders, as the taxpayer would do, results from " * * * insisting on using as a base for tax purposes a figure that in itself has no relation to taxation." *Commissioner* v. *Wheeler,* 324 U.S. 542, 546. Thus, where, as here, the fair market value of the property when returned to the stockholders is less than the basis when it was contributed to the corporation's capital, and where the distribution is a return of capital which is not out of earnings and profits, the equity invested capital and the corporation's excess profits tax credit would be augmented by the difference. In the present case, for example, the taxpayer seeks a net credit in excess of $1,600,000 because of property no longer invested by the stockholders in the business. In a converse

situation, where the fair market value has risen, equity invested capital and the corporation's credit would be reduced. Yet, quite plainly, in neither situation would the property, which had been withdrawn from the corporation's capital in previous years, have anything to do with the stockholders' continuing investment or the corporation's profits earned during the excess profits tax year. Under the construction adopted by the courts below, both such corporations would be in the same position with respect to the effect of the distribution on equity invested capital. There is nothing in the statutory scheme which sanctions the interpretation urged by the taxpayer which would result in different treatment for these corporations, despite the similarity of their situations with respect to the capital still invested by the stockholders.

The infirmity of the taxpayer's reasoning seems to spring from its assertion (Br. 9) as a proposition "not open to question" that property sold at a loss affects earned surplus but does not affect equity invested capital. This statement is erroneous for, since such a loss would reduce accumulated earnings and profits, it would necessarily reduce what is included in equity invested capital under Section 718(a)(4). This misunderstanding of equity invested capital permeates the taxpayer's entire reasoning, such as its conclusion that, once capital has been embarked in the enterprise (Br. 11), "It makes no difference what has

become of it." The taxpayer's reliance on the taxable effect to the stockholders of the return of capital by a distribution in kind (Pet. 3, Br. 10, 12-14) is misplaced for this has nothing to do with what invested capital the corporate taxpayer possessed during the taxable year.

2. There is no conflict in decisions. While the taxpayer (Pet. 3) asserts a conflict with *La Belle Iron Works* v. *United States,* 256 U.S. 377, that case, construing the different provisions of the prior law (see *Brown Shoe Co.* v. *Commissioner,* 339 U. S. 583, had nothing to do with capital withdrawn from the business by the stockholders. The language of the opinion there, moreover, is in harmony rather than in conflict with the decision here, for it emphasizes the capital invested in the business, not the capital already withdrawn. The absence of a conflict is also apparent from the taxpayer's further assertion that this case presents a question which has not been decided before. (Pet. 4.)

CONCLUSION

The decision below is correct. There are no conflicting decisions. No other reason exists which would warrant further review of the case by this Court. Accordingly, the petition for a writ of certiorari should be denied.

Respectfully submitted,

ARNOLD RAUM,
Acting Solicitor General.
THERON LAMAR CAUDLE,
Assistant Attorney General.
ELLIS N. SLACK,
HILBERT P. ZARKY,
Special Assistants to the Attorney General.

AUGUST, 1950.

☆ U. S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1950 856099 43

Office-Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
SEP 5 1950
CHARLES ELMORE CROPLEY
CLERK

No. 160

in the

SUPREME COURT
of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1950

REYNOLDS SPRING COMPANY,
A Delaware Corporation, *Petitioner,*

vs.

COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE,
Respondent.

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT

REPLY BRIEF FOR PETITIONER

THOMAS G. LONG,
Attorney for Petitioner.
1881 National Bank Bldg.
Detroit 26, Michigan

CAPITOL PRINTING CO., LAW PRINTERS, DETROIT, MICH.

No. 160

in the

SUPREME COURT
of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1950

REYNOLDS SPRING COMPANY,
A Delaware Corporation, *Petitioner,*

vs.

COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE,
Respondent.

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT

REPLY BRIEF FOR PETITIONER

Two statements in the Brief for Respondent seem to merit attention.

On page 7 it is said "the emphasis is on the capital invested by the stockholders and permitted to remain in the enterprise." It is submitted that "permitted to remain in the enterprise" has nothing to do with the matter. The contribution may have been in the form of a stock of mer-

chandise which may have completely burned the next day without any or adequate insurance coverage. Though the contribution thus does not "remain in the enterprise" invested capital is not affected.

On page 10 it is said in respect of a statement on page 9 of the Brief in support that "This misunderstanding of equity invested capital permeates the taxpayer's entire reasoning." The statement referred to in the Brief in support is "If property acquired by a corporation * * * is sold by the corporation at less than cost the loss does not affect *invested* capital but *earned* surplus only." What is done on page 10 of the Brief in opposition is to give the last quoted statement a meaning which on a fair reading it does not have. It was thought that by italicizing and thus contrasting the words "invested" and "earned" it was clear that "invested" was there being used in its ordinary dictionary meaning without any reference to its use in the Excess Profits Tax Law. Possibly "contributed" would have been a better word. At least it would have prevented any such argument as made on page 10 of the Brief in Opposition. Clearly if a corporation had invested (contributed) capital of $10,000 and earned surplus of $1,000 and then sold an asset at a loss of $2,000 the only effect would be on earned surplus. There would be no effect on invested (contributed) capital. Where a corporation has no earned surplus (petitioner had a deficit) there can be no possible effect on invested capital in any meaning of the term.

Respectfully submitted,

THOMAS G. LONG,
Counsel for Petitioner.